



ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The George Washington University

Washington, D. C.

October, 1967

I n a recent address, the United States Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, urged that as a people we must "stop thinking of our colleges and universities as postadolescent storage bins during the knowledge-injection cycle, and start thinking of them as incubators of leaders for the issues our society confronts." We must, he urged, become part of the action. It is my intention in this Annual Report to examine The George Washington University in the context of its relationship to the Federal Capital City in whose center it is located. Is it part of the action? Are its programs designed to produce the leaders the world needs? Are they contributing to solving the problems that beg for resolution?

George Washington's situation at the seat of the National government brings a pattern to its basic program that differs from that of most universities—even of most other urban institutions. A large proportion of undergraduate students are attracted to this city to study political science, urban and regional planning, public administration, and international politics, economics, and government. A good number of the research projects at the University involving the social sciences

are related to the needs and processes of government at all levels. A significant proportion of graduate-level instruction relates to the continuing development of members of the professions, civil servants, members of the armed forces, and the professional and technical staffs of research and development firms located in the surrounding area. All such specialized manpower groups share a great need in common; they require continued exposure to specialized, higher-level education to equip them for continued productivity in their fields. Finally, no less than is the case with teaching and research, the service functions of this University tend to be interpreted in terms of the complex and highly specialized needs of the Federal Capital City community.

George Washington University is stabilizing its undergraduate student body at approximately 4,000 students. Emphasis all through the University has turned toward improvement in the quality of both undergraduate and graduate education. Graduate work at the University is undergoing rapid growth. In 1955-56, a total of 418 graduate degrees and 1,461 undergraduate degrees were awarded during the year. In 1966-67, 2,238 graduate and 1,096 undergraduate degrees were granted. Applications and acceptances for doctoral study in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences are on the increase, as is the ratio of full- to part-time doctoral students and the number of Ph.D.'s awarded each year. This fall 500 doctoral students are registered in the School. By contrast, in 1962-63 there were 281 students in the Ph.D. programs; in 1958-59 there were but 170. Rich opportunities for original contributions to many fields of study exist in the Federal City. The pro-

grams of nearly every Federal agency and many large private organizations centered in Washington provide unmatched opportunities for research into the social, political, economic, and scientific issues that daily confront the Nation.

Students of the five area institutions comprising the Consortium of Universities—George Washington, American, Catholic, Howard, and Georgetown—continue to benefit from the program-enrichment made possible through the Consortium program. In the six semesters the Consortium has been in operation, 685 students have registered in 597 different courses not available on their own home campus. Until very recently, such interschool registration arrangements have been limited to graduate students, but beginning this year an undergraduate at any one of the five institutions may take foreign language courses at any of the others, with permission from his department. The five universities together offer courses in 29 different languages. This new arrangement at the undergraduate level represents a real step forward in service to the community on the part of all the universities, and is the precursor of still further cooperative efforts.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SCHOOL

George Washington University's growth in service to the citizens and the agencies of the Federal City area is exemplified in the development of the University's School of Government and Business Administration. The present-day School, whose antecedents can be traced back to 1898, was created in 1966, as was the School of Public and Inter-

national Affairs, from the former School of Government, Business, and International Affairs. Today's School of Government and Business Administration has four departments—Accounting, Business Administration, Health Care Administration, and Public Administration—and two major contract programs offering candidacy for the M.B.A. degree to members of the Armed Forces—the Navy Graduate Financial Management Program and the Air Force Advanced Management Program.

The School of Government and Business Administration is preparing to take its place among the leading schools of administration in the United States. In approaching this goal, the School has placed first emphasis on acquiring a competent faculty. In 1955 the programs of what is now this School were served by 8 full-time and 21 part-time faculty. Today the programs of the School are served by 49 full-time and 50 part-time faculty. Since the same date, the proportion of course offerings taught by full-time faculty has increased from one-third to two-thirds of the total.

In a day when institutions serving both day and night students often have programs of different quality for the two, an important policy emphasis of the School has been to provide a sound instructional program for the employed students coming to campus each evening from Government agencies, businesses, and the military services. Forty-five per cent of the undergraduates in the School attend on a part-time basis, while 35 per cent of the graduate students attend part-time. The School makes every effort to provide the same quality of educational program for these students as it does for the full-time student. There is no evening division as such, nor any

special evening faculty. All full-time faculty must teach some courses in the evening, and some teach exclusively then.

The School responds strongly to the educational needs of the Federal City community in offering a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs in such fields as Health Care Administration, Automatic Data Processing, Operations Research, Transportation, Finance and Controllershship, and International Public Administration.

Common elements are required in the educational programs for both Business and Public Administration—studies of administrative theory, behavioral science, and quantitative methods. The integration of these elements common to both business and public administration is of critical importance in this city where a continuous interface of operation exists between governmental and private organizations.

Among the programs of the School, three will suggest the range of response to Washington and the larger National community.

An area of accounting in which the School is developing outstanding competence is Government Financial Management. The instructional program offered is reinforced by the School's publication of the *Federal Accountant*, a quarterly professional journal cosponsored by the Federal Government Accountants' Association, and by the School's operation of the Federal Financial Management Information Center, an educational research center dealing with budgeting and accounting procedures and policies.

An interdisciplinary program in urban and regional planning within the School is designed to provide a professional education in the planning and administration of urban affairs.

This program draws extensively from the fields of public administration, economics, engineering, law, and political science. Part of the program involves cooperation with Virginia Polytechnic Institute, which sends its seniors in urban and regional planning to the George Washington campus each fall, providing for them a direct involvement with the vast metropolitan laboratory of the Washington community.

The field of International Business is developing strongly. Principally a graduate program, the work is based on the required common elements in administration, but also draws from other fields, including economics and political science. In the fall of 1964, enrollment in this then newly-developing program included five masters' candidates and three doctoral candidates. The fall, 1967, enrollment includes 103 masters' and 16 doctoral candidates.

THE RANGE OF THE MISSION

Remarks on the range of the university mission could just as well be addressed to the subject of innovation and change, for it is out of societal change, or the need to stimulate it, that the breadth of the university mission arises in the first instance.

Consider for example this University's program in Continuing Education for Women. This program was developed to meet a need that has become fully recognized in society only since World War II. Many women, with 20 to 30 productive years of life ahead after their children reach school age, develop a strong desire to put their time and abilities

to work in the service of society. A special response by appropriate agencies becomes necessary. One such agency is the college or university.

As a part of its Continuing Education for Women Program, George Washington offers "New Horizons for Women," a noncredit, orientation course designed to help mature women wishing to return to work—to help them develop their potential by exploring educational and occupational opportunities suited to their particular skills, education, and interests. As a further step in helping Washington women with families resolve their educational needs, the University offers an array of degree-credit courses off-campus, with classes taught by members of the regular faculty and staff and held in church facilities throughout metropolitan Washington.

Another area in which a national need becomes clear and in which educational institutions respond lies in the ongoing education of military personnel. As in business, industry, and government, strong emphasis upon education has developed within the career armed services of this country in the past two decades. A civilian institution such as George Washington can make a significant contribution to the continuing education of military personnel.

Vital parts of this University's total mission are the joint military cooperative programs it conducts at the Master's level with the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the National War College at Fort McNair, Washington, D. C.; the Air War College and the Command and Staff College of the Air University, at Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama; and the Naval War College at Newport, Rhode Island.

An overview of the University's many-sided mission, and its development out of innovation, would be incomplete without reference to the continuing work of the Program of Policy Studies in Science and Technology. Established with support from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this Program is building an interdisciplinary public policy research capability at the University, enabling George Washington to provide an institutional response to a wide range of national policy problems bearing on science and society. Specific projects in progress under the Program include studies of the effect of technological change on the civilian economy, the processes by which allocations of resources for science are made, government relief programs for major disasters, conflicts of interest among Federal organizations, and "Education in the 70's"—a forecast of model school systems of the next decade utilizing computer-assisted instruction as an integral component of education.

It is a long step from public policy studies, in terms of mission, to the Secondary School Junior Honors Program held for the first time this summer, but both programs relate to the subjects of change and of institutional responsibility. Through the Junior Honors Program, 39 qualified area high school juniors were encouraged to take regular five-week college courses in the University's Summer Sessions. Their programs of study developed college credit or could be counted for Carnegie units if desired. Some of these high school students reported initial surprise at the faster pace of college work; but, most importantly, all submitted above-average work in class in comparison with regular undergraduates of the University. They plan to enter a variety

of colleges. Eight will enter G.W., with three of these arranging to omit their senior year in high school. The University is planning a three-fold expansion of this program next year, inviting national participation, and studying carefully the amount and nature of secondary school and college instruction that may be appropriately combined for other groups of gifted students.

In the varying functions of the University—providing continuing education for women and for military personnel, building a public policy research capability, and providing better school-college transition for gifted students—there are always elements of innovative initial action, as well as mere reaction to need. The institution of higher education that becomes just a social response mechanism is a dying institution. At G.W., it is the individual academic department which serves as the seedbed of new departures in the educational, research, and service programs. Some universities have a single administrative “center” intended to serve as a catalyst for change. At George Washington, such action is expected from the individual faculty member who is in the forefront of his field of study. It is he who is the G.W. version of the “built-in revolutionary device” Chancellor Roger Heyns of Berkeley has advocated as an administrative unit. It is this faculty member who, for example, secured the interest and support from the National Science Foundation that enabled undergraduate majors in anthropology to take part in ethnographic research in Venezuela this summer. It is this faculty member who designed the flexible curriculum of the School of Medicine and advocated the trimester system to permit the school to serve a 50 per cent larger student body. It is he who devel-

oped, in cooperation with the American and Federal Bar Associations, the Law School's second national institute on "Computers and Taxes." This is George Washington's greatest resource for change—the individual member of the faculty.

GRANTS FOR STUDY, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE

This spring, George Washington University received a grant from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration providing a number of \$1,800 to \$2,000 traineeship stipends for graduate students to take part in a new two-year program of course and field work in Rehabilitation Counselor Education. During the first full year of his program, each student spends one day each week in one of the many District of Columbia area agencies providing rehabilitation services to the physically, mentally, or emotionally disabled. The student serves in three different agencies during his first year. During his second year, he spends three days each week in still a fourth agency, with his work assuming increasing responsibility. The student in this program is prepared for immediate employment as a rehabilitation counselor upon graduation, bringing with him new knowledge, skills, and interests that can upgrade rehabilitation agency services in Washington and elsewhere in the Nation.

Early this summer, the University received a grant of \$194,000 from the United States Office of Education to fund a new Special Education Instructional Materials Center that will be located in the new classroom building to be begun in January. The Materials Center

will be involved in research and evaluation of educational materials designed for children with many kinds of specific learning disabilities. Part of a national program sponsoring 13 other such centers nationally, the George Washington Center will serve the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. For these states, the G.W. Center will provide a source for curriculum materials and learning aids for use in the instruction of handicapped learners, as well as a continuous program for demonstrating and evaluating these materials.

Also in the area of Special Education, Assistant Professor Margaret H. Moss has been developing and building normative data on a Test of Basic Information—a nonverbal test of the information young children from deprived socioeconomic backgrounds possess before they begin first grade. Development of this picture test, under Office of Economic Opportunity support of \$83,000, is expected to provide Head Start Centers and other agencies with a good index of the deprived child's general knowledge, without providing him the customary handicap that arises the moment a test-giver begins to talk to him from a middle-class frame of reference.

Since 1964, Dr. Selma J. Mushkin has directed the State and Local Finances Project, funded under a grant from the Ford Foundation and representing a strong collaborative enterprise of university and state and local governments. The purpose of this project has been to improve the tools for decision-making available to state and local governments—to encourage their application of advance fiscal planning supported by modern analytical methods. This year George Washington received a new grant of \$300,000 from the

Ford Foundation for a State and Local Finances Project demonstration of new techniques for Program Planning and Budgeting to be applied in five cities, five counties, and five states. The "5-5-5 Project," as it has been named, gives the University an excellent opportunity to contribute to the nationwide search for means of rational and efficient allocation of scarce public resources. The long-run objective of the State and Local Finances Project is to strengthen the planning and management of public services along an intergovernmental pattern.

This year again, for two weeks in August and September, George Washington conducted a resident "Pre-University Workshop," sponsored by the Agency for International Development, for foreign students entering the United States for the first time and preparing to enroll in American colleges and universities. The workshop was designed to prepare these students for the entirely new experience ahead of them. It reviewed the system of higher education in this country; provided instruction and practice in classroom procedures; covered examination techniques, note taking, report writing, and use of a library; and brought up for discussion many other facets of American college life for which foreign students are often unprepared.

The Pre-University Workshop, the 5-5-5 Project, the Test of Basic Information, the Special Education Instructional Materials Center, and the Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program all have one feature in common—from among the number and variety of grants and contracts received by George Washington for study, research, and service projects this past year, these five exemplify the kinds of publicly and privately-supported

functions this urban institution is particularly well equipped to conduct in the Capital of the United States.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Having noted earlier the progress of the Consortium of Universities, it would be timely to review certain of the teaching program affiliations and cooperative research arrangements between George Washington and agencies of the Federal Government.

The newest cooperative arrangement with a branch of the Government is an affiliation with the Library of Congress, under which the University began offering, this fall, a doctoral program in American Thought and Culture, with an emphasis on Library Research and Collections. Doctoral students of the University will receive supervision from scholars of the Library staff participating in the program. The students will be assigned to particular Library staff members according to their interest in working in specific Library collections. Intended to emphasize the subject matter of library collections more than has been the case with traditional library science programs, this new cooperative program with the Library of Congress should help to fill the national need for scholarly administrators of specialized research libraries covering many fields of knowledge.

Another interinstitutional arrangement providing an important new educational resource for the Washington area is the affiliation of George Washington's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences with the Smithsonian Institution in a program for graduate students

in the History of American Civilization. This program provides a vital link between George Washington University's doctoral fields of study related to the material culture of the United States and the Smithsonian Institution's resources of staff, manuscripts, and historical objects. Doctoral students in this program work under curatorial supervision in the reference collections of the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of History and Technology.

During the summer of 1966 and again this summer, George Washington administered a six-week combined instructional and research program, supported by the Bureau of Research of the United States Office of Education and using the resources of the National Gallery of Art, to study ways of improving art education in secondary schools. Forty high school teachers from 26 states were housed on campus to take this program demonstrating and evaluating the ways in which museum resources can be used to supplement and enrich high school art instruction.

To conclude these brief notes about some of George Washington's cooperative programs with Federal institutions in Washington, it would be of interest to examine a single, relatively-new department of the University and the variety of its cooperative graduate research arrangements. In 1958 the Geology Department consisted of one professor with two rooms. Today, with a combined full- and part-time staff of fourteen, and greatly expanded laboratory, lecture, study, collection, and library facilities, the Department offers—in addition to its undergraduate programs—graduate programs in geochemistry, geomorphology, marine geology, mineralogy,

paleontology, petrology, sedimentation, stratigraphy, and structural geology.

The research environment in Washington—the opportunity for cooperative work between the Geology Department and other institutions—is second to none. Members of the Department are cooperating in research projects with the United States Geological Survey, the Environmental Science Services Administration, and the Smithsonian Institution. Associate Professor Lucian B. Platt is cooperating with the Geological Survey in mapping a large area in Southwestern Idaho and adjacent Wyoming containing reserves of high-grade phosphate, oil, coal, and helium. Associate Professor Anthony G. Coates is currently working with Dr. Erle G. Kauffman, Associate Curator at the Smithsonian and Adjunct Professor at George Washington, and with two staff members of the Geological Survey, on a study of the Cretaceous faunas of the Caribbean. Dr. Charles Milton's research includes discovery of four new mineral species of merumite, a chrome mineral from Guyana. He is cooperating with the Geological Survey of Guyana in this work. Dr. Frederic R. Siegel of the Department, together with Dr. Jack W. Pierce, Adjunct Professor at George Washington and Curator in Charge, Division of Sedimentology, of the Smithsonian, is engaged in major geochemical and sedimentation studies of the Atlantic Shelf of Argentina, in cooperation with the Argentine National Oceanographic Committee.

The resources of the Washington environment, and the interests and capability of the staff and graduate students of a vigorous young department, have combined to form a varied and productive program of cooperative geological research.

At this time when national organizations are calling for student seizure of various campus powers, tough campus newspaper campaigns, nationwide student anti-draft or pro-war stands, and assorted other efforts all too frequently dignified by the term "activism" (and covered in a broader context later in this report), quite a different kind of activism is being practiced by student groups on many college and university campuses throughout the Nation—the activism of concerned social service. At George Washington, a growing number of students are devoting long hours of selfless effort to such service, through membership in SERVE, a nonsectarian campus organization sponsored by the United Christian Fellowship, the Episcopal Students Association, and the Newman Club.

SERVE projects all have a dual purpose—to help persons in need, and to instill in each G.W. student volunteer a rational understanding and a deep permanent concern for the problems allied to poverty in our society. The students of SERVE have organized a number of projects for the teaching of basic reading skills; for help with recreation, dance, and music programs; and for service as teachers' assistants, in D.C.-area programs relating to the culturally-disadvantaged, the mentally-retarded, the sight-handicapped, and other persons doubly affected by conditions of poverty. SERVE volunteers teach basic reading skills each week on a one-to-one basis to prisoners in Washington, D.C., Jail. They serve as Teachers' Assistants at the Grant, Stevens, and Sumner Schools. They help provide tutoring and enrichment programs

in the Southeast Neighborhood House, the First Congregational Church, Grant School, and Francis Junior High School. They tutor slow-learners at the Logan School. They work at Junior Village, and at D. C. General Hospital, in the children's wards and in an adult literacy program.

SERVE is fulfilling a vital presence on the George Washington campus. It provides an opportunity for G.W. students to develop the commitment of active participation in acute social problems of our day. SERVE carries on its programs under the philosophy, "It's your Capital, It's your Country, What Can You Do About It?" This is student activism at its very best. The experience of each SERVE volunteer will become a meaningful part of a liberal education at this University, taking its place in supplement to classroom study. The University is proud to have the independent action-orientated students of SERVE on its campus, in the service of citizens of the Federal City.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Six new Charter Trustees were elected by the University Board of Trustees this year. They are: Harry F. Duncan, Chairman of the Board of the Little Tavern Shops, Inc.; Thornton W. Owen, President of Thomas J. Owen & Son, Inc., and President of the Perpetual Building Association; Charles E. Smith, Chairman of the Board of Charles E. Smith Companies, and of the Madison National Bank; John W. Warner, attorney, Hogan and Hartson; Stephen R. Woodzell, President of the Potomac Electric Power Company; Eugene M. Zuckert, attorney, Lear, Scoutt and Rasen-

berger, and former Secretary of the Air Force. At the time of these elections, the status of Honorary Trustee was conferred upon three retiring Charter Trustees: Walter M. Bastian, John R. McKee, and Sidney W. Souers. James C. Van Story, Jr., Alumni Trustee for two terms, was succeeded by Edgar R. Baker, Vice President of Time, Inc. These trustee elections and retirements bring the number of active trustees to 36.

The Board of Trustees, in its January meeting, approved a University budget of \$42,418,958 for the 1967-68 fiscal year. This budget, \$4 million larger than the 1966-67 budget, reflects a general strengthening of the University's academic posture. The budget allocated \$100,000 in new funds for services and resources of the University's libraries. It provided for the reorganization of the former Graduate Council into the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It provided for maintenance of the "A" level of the American Association of University Professors' average salary scale for instructors and assistant professors at the University, reaching the "A" level for associate professors and the "B" level for full professors. At the January meeting, the Board of Trustees also approved income and expenditure projections for the years 1968-69, 1969-70, and 1970-71, so that the orderly development of the University could proceed within the guidelines of a long-term plan. A most significant goal provided in the projections is the achievement of the AAUP "A" scale for all faculty ranks by 1970-71. Estimated tuition rates were also built into the four-year projections, in order that students and parents could themselves plan more effectively for the years of college.

FIVE-YEAR DEVELOPMENT GOALS

The most significant action by the Board of Trustees during the year—one which will have immeasurable impact upon George Washington's future—was the Board's approval of a five-year development plan designed to increase University assets by nearly \$90 million by 1972. The five-year development goals include financing of new physical facilities through gifts, grants, and loans; tripling the University's endowment funds; and intensifying the search for unrestricted funds. New facilities to be constructed at an estimated cost of \$65,200,000 include a University Center, a major classroom building, a \$35 million Medical Center, a new University Library, a Recreation-Physical Education-Athletics Building, and a Center for Art Education.

The five-year development program approved by the Board also provides for the creation of five endowed faculty chairs (\$3,000,000), 15 endowed professorships (\$3,000,000), and 20 new teaching fellowships (\$2,500,000). A Faculty Research Fund is planned through future gifts totalling \$1,250,000. Additional library resources will be sought through gifts for a fund to total \$2,500,000. Endowment funds for student aid will be sought in the amount of \$3,500,000, while \$5,000,000 will be sought for general endowment funds.

In all, \$88,450,000 in new resources will be sought during the five-year period to 1972, including more than \$54,000,000 from private gifts. A capital campaign is now in progress for the Law Library. Other capital campaigns will soon be conducted for the Medical Center and for the Recreation-Physical Education-

Athletics Building. Special presentations will be made to major prospects for the remaining physical facilities and endowment needs, while at the same time the yearly search for expendable funds will continue through the University's Annual Support Program.

CURRENT CONSTRUCTION AND PLANS

The site for the University Center has been cleared, and construction has begun. This six-story building of 332,000 square feet, made possible by an \$8,000,000 privately financed loan, is planned to meet the combined requirements of a student union, a faculty club, an alumni center, and a little theatre. With construction adhering to schedule, the building should be occupied in the fall of 1969.

The University Librarian has completed a conceptual study of needed Library facilities. The study is being circulated in the University for review and subsequent use as the basis for architectural design. Planning will proceed rapidly; the schedule calls for application prior to February 15 for Federal construction grants and loans to be made available in fiscal years 1968 and 1969. In addition to these applications for Federal support, efforts are underway to stimulate the interest of major private sources of support. A new University Library remains the facility of highest priority in the University.

The organizational stage of the coming campaign for funds to build the \$35 million University Medical Center will culminate this fall with a public announcement of campaign

goals. Already, approximately \$4 million in assets are in hand or pledged toward the \$17 million share of Medical Center costs needed from private sources. This amount includes a \$1 million pledge toward the \$15.5 million Basic Sciences Building. In regard to Federal support for the building, a site survey by a U. S. Public Health Service team was made on July 20, in connection with the University's application to the USPHS for more than \$8 million in matching construction funds. The University's application for a Medical Library Construction Grant has been approved by the Trustees of the National Library of Medicine, and awaits funding. Remodeling of the Keystone Apartments as a Clinics Building begins this winter. Remodeling of the University Hospital will continue until the building as a whole has reached the standard of the new Meyer Pavilion.

There are many other developments on campus. Construction of the new Law Library has been completed, as has renovation of the Law Center building, Stockton Hall. Lisner Auditorium has been redecorated and air-conditioned. Luther Rice Hall, the new administrative and faculty office building, is open. The Joseph Henry Building, with G.W. offices and leased office space, is open. Plans for the new Classroom Building are in the stage of final architectural design, and construction should begin by January 1. Plans for the Recreation-Physical Education-Athletics Building have reached the stage where they will serve as the basis for a fund-raising campaign to be launched during the 1967-68 academic year. Meanwhile, the annual savings resulting from the University's discontinuance of varsity football, \$250,000 annually, are being set aside to help meet building costs.

Those who visit the George Washington campus this year will see these and many other changes from the past years of the "G Street Campus." Many persons have helped bring about these changes—faculty, staff, trustees, alumni, students, friends in the Washington community and across the Nation. An object of unusual interest is the large, welded stainless steel sculpture erected in the University Yard behind Monroe Hall, which will be placed in the Yard of the University Center when that building is completed. The sculpture is a Master of Fine Arts thesis submitted this year by Rudolph A. Heinze, A.B., 1964, accepted by the faculty of the Department of Art, and approved for future location in the Center by the University's architectural consultants, with construction made possible through a gift from alumnus Julian H. Singman, Class of 1950. Truly the development of a modern university campus is the work and the concern of many hands!

In completing this report, written at the conclusion of my second year as President of The George Washington University and the beginning of my twelfth year in university administration, I should like to examine a matter that should be of major concern to every citizen interested in the American university as the major force for the preservation of the social heritage, the discovery of new knowledge, and the use of both in the service of society. I have before me three urgings of special interest groups, from among the many such statements of advocacy that cross my desk each month. One is a letter from a civic organization urging all-out University support of a particular community project of little relation to the competence of the University. Another is a circular on student

power calling on college administrators to accept the special viewpoints of the sponsor and to "cease exercising power in opposition to these policies." The third piece of mail is a communication from a new national group urging all universities and colleges to refuse to undertake classified research of any nature for either government or industry.

Such communications and countless others—written, telephoned, and visited over, and representing every conceivable special interest—have become today's standard fare for university chief executives. The matter which all citizens should take to their deepest concern is this: Who shall put to use such diverse forces for the constructive benefit that is often hidden in them? How shall the pathway to real institutional progress be selected from among the hundred and one trails advocated?

WHO WILL RUN THE UNIVERSITY?

Since the Middle Ages, academic people have given time and attention to the governance of the university. At that period of history only students and professors—and a very few of each could be found—were interested in the question. The general public became concerned only when the traveling band of teachers and students behaved in such a way as to make themselves unwelcome in the community. At that point the citizenry insisted that the students and teachers take their favors elsewhere.

Cities did not seek to establish universities, and for many years those that were established existed through sufferance rather than because of public support. The public

attributed no particular value to the presence of the university; it was at best an institution to be ignored, and at worst one to be feared. Much has changed since the early beginnings of the university. Of significance has been the growing acceptance of the university as an important institution of society. In many quarters the university is now regarded as civilization's most effective instrument and, perhaps, man's last hope for survival.

"Who will run the university" is no longer a matter to be left to small (or large) bands of teachers and students. The question is now important to individuals, groups, and causes alike, and it has become a matter of national and international policy as well. Answers to the question still affect teachers and scholars, but reach also slum-dwellers and farmers, philanthropists and politicians, the unborn and the retired. The objective in raising the question here is to examine it from the posture of trying to find the means of governance which will permit the best functioning of the institution—of permitting the university to make its maximum contribution to mankind.

The university is pictured today by some imaginative writers as a great prize being fought over by hungry professors, bloodthirsty students, scheming administrators, power-mad trustees, or carousing alumni. Demons are said to lurk in each and every camp, ready to capture the Aladdin-like lamp that is the university and divert its all-encompassing powers to selfish and wicked ends. To such writers it matters not that men who serve as trustees are also alumni, that administrators are or have been professors, that all have been students—most of them for a much longer period than any student generation at a given moment.

The trap of generalization has caught all groups. Listen to the ready slogans: "Students must manage their own affairs"; "the educational program is in the hands of faculty"; "trustees give, get, or get off"; "alumni for football and fraternities"; "administrators are pawns of the power structure" (with the latter variously interpreted as politicians, big corporations, undercover agents, or anti-intellectuals) are but examples of the inadequate, incomplete, and sometimes deliberately misleading interpretations, by careless news analysts, of events at the university. Some have even gone so far as to picture the college sophomore as quite well equipped to take over the assets of the university, to redesign the campus, improve investment policy, strengthen liaison with the legislature and governor, and write the proposal to end all proposals to the Ford Foundation!

Equally helpful, along with the naive news-writer, is the alumnus (professor, administrator, politician, friend, or self-seeker), who suggests, or decides to lead, a fight for the banning of controversial speakers, the establishment of a branch campus in his home town, restricting alcoholic beverages to alumni activities, appointing to the Board of Trustees the institution's greatest athlete, or securing an honorary degree for a friend.

Will one group or individual run the university to the exclusion of all others? This question which has not always concerned many people is now a matter of importance to all people.

Higher education was accepted early in America as a need of the general public. Colleges in the colonial period were church-related functions, and the citizenry responded

to this control and support of colleges through the church. Not until later, when new functions were assigned by society to colleges and universities, was control shifted to boards of trustees broadly representative of the general public welfare. The favored status of the university continued to grow in acceptance by the citizenry, as evidenced by legislation, court decisions, and public support.

Today, by an evolutionary process, the roles of trustee, professor, student, and all other members of the university family have changed. The curriculum, once rigidly prescribed by a board of trustees—"inspectors" or "overseers"—is now the direct responsibility of the faculty. Professional organizations, scholarly societies, employers, and many other interests, however, exercise varying degrees of influence on the educational program. So central is the university to the affairs of the world that all societal winds have some effect, directly or indirectly, on the decisions made therein. One of the most direct influences today is that of the student. This should come as no surprise to anyone; the student has long been involved in decision-making in the university. In the Middle Ages he and his classmates hired and fired professors, begged or stole food, and negotiated with the sheriff.

As cycles come and go, terminology changes. Student participation in the governance of the university, in keeping with the fashion, has become "student power." Trustee power, professor power, administrator power, alumni power, or politician power would be equally appropriate concepts. Today, as in the Middle Ages, the question of the "right" role of the student is with us. Our democratic way of life suggests the meaningful participation of all interested and responsible parties—not alone

students—as a fundamental principle to be followed.

Many years ago President Sills of Bowdoin responded to the demands of students for a greater voice in college affairs with the comment: "What students have to say is always interesting, sometimes important, but not necessarily conclusive." It may be worth reminding ourselves that this principle includes students, but certainly does not exclude alumni, faculty, administrative officers, parents, trustees, and the general public. Dr. Sills could just as easily have been speaking of any of these; all have an important stake in the governance of the university.

Educational institutions, both private and public, are provided for, encouraged to develop, and given various forms of support because their services are in the public interest. It is ridiculous, therefore, to assume that the general public, through its many-faceted support for private and public higher education, will forego its own participation in the educational process while continuing to bear various kinds of economic, political, and social responsibility for higher education. Institutions of higher education have been struggling for decades in an attempt to determine the best ways in which meaningful participation of the general public can be meshed with the participation of other more easily identifiable parts of the university family. Working through a Governing Board, the general public has approved in principle the delegation by the trustees to the faculty of the responsibility for molding academic policy. Standards of admission, courses, programs and curricula, as well as graduation requirements, are now quite generally recommended by appropriate faculty groups, and

approved without question by administrative officers and trustees. The exercise of this responsibility by the faculty has become widely accepted both within and beyond the university.

Students seeking a greater voice in college and university affairs turned initially to the rules of social conduct, and to extracurricular activities, for participation. All too often the students' target for change has continued to be the rules of dormitory living, or the operation of the campus bookstore, rather than concern with, and participation in, the questions of the educational program itself. Participation for students has consisted all too often of nibbling at the fringes, with the accompanying frustration of nibbling, but without confrontation with the main core of educational experience.

Student participation is desirable; and it is necessary if the university learning experience is to be fully meaningful. Faculty participation is desirable; and it is necessary if first-rate scholars are to continue to do their best work. Administrators are desirable; and they are necessary if policies are to be implemented. The work of trustees is desirable; and it is necessary if adequate liaison with the general public is to be maintained. Alumni participation is desirable; and it is necessary as another means of bridging the gap between the greater public and the institution itself. If all such groups should have a voice in the university, then by what means may this principle be put into practice? Let us see how it can be effected with students, as an example.

The tendency to view things as all good or all bad, the temptation to seek all authority or no authority, to exercise veto power or to

feel complete frustration—these are human tendencies which may be most sharply felt by college students. We may be by now, however, sufficiently mature as a society and as colleges and universities to map out meaningful lines of participation which will bring students face to face with the educational activities of the university. Multipurpose universities today certainly should be able to involve students directly in academic deliberations of departments, divisions, and even schools and colleges. Within academic disciplines, upper-level students have something responsible to say—and should be clearly invited to say it—about course evaluations (as distinguished from evaluations of professors), electives, sequences for majors, service courses for nonmajors, course-consolidations, new offerings and reorganizations, and, along with all other interested parties, interdisciplinary courses as well. It is a bitter truth that new courses and seminars which grow out of recent Ph.D. theses would face rough sledding if students, rather than department chairmen who are faced with the problem of recruiting, were given a real voice as to the introduction of such new offerings.

As there are many ways in which students can be helpful in academic affairs, so it is that alumni—those who have gone to work directly from colleges as well as those who have proceeded to further education in professional and graduate schools—can be genuinely constructive. It follows, however, that participation in the academic affairs of a university requires by its very nature a thoroughgoing objectivity. What is needed is a calm and methodical procedure for such participation, devoid of ultimatums and expediency—those factors that so often leave scar tissue

that will not heal. Much of the difficulty that has arisen in recent years on the university campus is due to the efforts of special groups to use the university in ways which the university cannot be used: to manage the campaign for or against civil rights, to conclude or speed up the war in Vietnam, to protect the oil-depletion allowance, or to defy society's generally accepted ethical or legal standards. In all too many cases someone asks the university to encourage, to legalize, or to allow activities or behavior which the rest of society rejects.

A final point—the commonly-conceived divisions of interest groups within the university and beyond its boundaries are exaggerated and artificial. The trouble with “alumni power,” for example, is that by the time such power is achieved, the alumnus has become a parent whose son or daughter is a student, and the point of view of the latter may well be of greater immediacy than the parent's. All individuals and groups—professors, students, administrators, alumni, trustees, and the general public—must regard themselves first of all as citizens of, and friends to, the university. Any university's survival, as well as adequate nourishment for its continued good health, would be greatly endangered today without the ongoing participation and support of each group. How ridiculous it would be to cut off the university from intimate liaison with the general public! Equally ridiculous would be a requirement that the professor submit his course outline for approval to the students who have registered for his seminar, or to the alumni who have returned for a reunion.

That which is good for students—or administrators, or the general public, or alumni, or

professors, or trustees—may also be of value for the institution as a whole, or it may not. This is the key question. Each proposal remains to be examined with thorough objectivity in regard to this all-important factor—its contribution to the betterment of the college or university program. In the final analysis, the very best governance will be that which provides a fair hearing for all voices; draws from each advocate's position such strength and direction as will foster the growth and development of the teaching, research, and service programs; and melds these forces into a unified directional guide for the future of the institution.

—LLOYD H. ELLIOTT

October, 1967